

REMARKS

The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 15, 2005. Claims 39 to 44 and 47 to 54 are in the application, of which Claims 39, 43, 44, 50 and 54 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 39 to 44 and 47 to 53 were under rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, claim 44 has been amended so that it is directed to a computer program product "stored on a computer-readable memory medium", in keeping with the guidance at MPEP § 2106:

"... When a computer program is recited in conjunction with a physical structure, such as a computer memory, Office personnel should treat the claim as a product claim. See paragraph IV.B.2(a), below." (Page MPEP 2100-13)

It should be noted that the referenced section of the MPEP (i.e., MPEP § 2106.IV.B.2(a)) very clearly authorizes a claim in the format of claim 44 as a "manufacture" which is statutory. In view of this amendment, withdrawal of the § 101 rejection of claim 44 is respectfully requested.

The remaining rejections under § 101 are respectfully traversed. Claims 39 and 50, for example, are clearly directed to methods, and the fact that they are "not tangibly embodied in a computer-readable medium" is irrelevant. Likewise, independent claim 43 is directed to an apparatus, and the fact that it "does not contain a computer component" is similarly irrelevant. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 39 to 44 and 47 to 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,006,225 (Bowman). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The invention concerns the provision of information according to a two-step search. First, a search is made for first information corresponding to an identification code, wherein the first information has a keyword. Second, a search is made for second information based on the keyword of the first information. Thereafter, the first information and second information are output together as visible information.

It might be true, as asserted in the Office Action, that Bowman makes a first search. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Bowman does not make a second search as set out in the claims, and consequently could not possibly output first and second information together as visible information.

In entering the rejection over Bowman, the Office Action took the position that Bowman's column 14 discusses a second search in the context of a search term such as "bike" in the figure 9 example. Applicants have studied this section of Bowman carefully, and respectfully disagree with the conclusions drawn in the Office Action. As Applicants see it, this section of Bowman describes a search based on the keyword "outdoor trail", resulting in information such as "outdoor trail-bike", "outdoor trail-sports" and "outdoor trail-vacation". Thereafter, however, there is no follow-up searching performed on the search results. In particular, Bowman does not perform searching such as a search on the keyword "bike" in the search result of the "outdoor trail-bike". It is therefore respectfully submitted that Bowman differs significantly from the claimed invention, such that the claims herein recite subject matter that is neither anticipated nor would have been obvious from Bowman. Allowance of the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

An Information Disclosure Statement, with fee, accompanies this amendment. Consideration of the information cited therein is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 97505v1